REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 19, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 to 17, 20 to 77, 79, 80, 82 to 108 and 110 to 124 are the pending claims, of which Claims 1, 11, 16, 24, 29, 31, 75, 107, 108, 111 and 112, the independent claims, are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). More particularly, Claims 1, 16, 29, 75, 107 and 108 are rejected over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,385 (Wies) and U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696 (Lindhorst), Claims 2, 4, 9 to 13, 17, 22 to 26, 30 to 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82, 85 to 106 and 110 to 124 are rejected over Wies, Lindhorst, and U.S. Patent No. 5,996,003 (Namikata), Claims 7, 8, 20, 21, 83 and 84 are rejected over Wies, Lindhorst, Namikata and U.S. Patent No. 5,708,780 (Levergood), and Claims 14, 15, 27 and 28 are rejected over Wies, Lindhorst, Namikata and U.S. Patent No. 6,128,649 (Smith). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 recites a method of adding interactive functionality to a web-page. According to the method, a request for the web-page is received from a first user, The requested web-page is retrieved, and script code is embedded within the requested web-page to add interactive functionality to the web-page. The script code is embedded in the requested web-page by parsing the requested web-page to determine an appropriate location to embed script code that is absent from the requested web page prior to the parsing. The requested web-page having the embedded script code is transmitted to the first user.

The applied art, namely Wies and Lindhorst, fails to disclose each and every one of the claimed features.

The Office Action concedes that Weis fails to disclose parsing a web-page to determine

an appropriate location to embed the script code. As discussed below, Lindhorst fails to disclose

this feature as well.

More particularly, according to Lindhorst,
> "... a document is parsed in order to separate the objects, HTML
> text, and scripts from one another. As will be explained below, the
> object, HTML text and scripts are separated from one another and
> stored in memory storages so that they can be acted upon
> individually by the Script Wizard software." (See Lindhorst, col.,
> 11, lines 41 to 49)

Thus, the parsing is performed in Lindhorst to separate the elements of the document

from one another. Lindhorst's parsing to separate elements is nothing like the claimed two-fold

feature of parsing to determine an appropriate location to embed script code.

Lindhorst parses an HTML document to separate the elements so that the elements can be

presented to a user/developer in a user interface of a Script Wizard development tool. The user

uses the Script Wizard software to edit the elements. As part of the editing process, the user can

add script code using the Script Wizard software. In one example provided by Lindhorst, the

user adds script code to link an event and an action. In the case that the user adds script code to

the HTML document, the user selects the element for which the script code is to be added.

Based on the user's selection, the Script Wizard software associates the script code and the

element selected by the user. Once the user finishes editing the different elements, the Script

Wizard rebuilds the HTML document. The new script code is inserted into the HTML document

based on the element association identified by the user during the editing process. Referring to

Figure 8 of Lindhorst, if the element identified by the user during the editing session is an object

element, the script code is inserted above the object tag in the HTML document. If the element

identified by the user during the editing session is an HTML element, the script code is inserted

within the HTML tag in the HTML document.

Thus, Lindhorst parses to separate elements of an HTML document. Lindhorst's parsing to separate elements of an HTML document is not the same as parsing to determine a location to embed script code. According to Lindhorst, the location of script code added by the user is determined by the user during the user's editing session using Lindhorst's Script Wizard development tool. Lindhorst fails to teach, suggest or describe embedding script code into a requested web-page by parsing the web-page to determine a location for script code that is absent from the requested web page prior to said parsing. Nothing in Lindhorst teach, suggests or describes parsing a requested web-page to determine a location to embed script code that is absent from the requested web page prior to said parsing.

Accordingly, neither Wies nor Lindhorst, alone or in any permissible combination (if one in fact even exists, a point not conceded by Applicants), teach, suggest or describe each and every one of the elements of the claimed invention.

The cited portions of Namikata have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above.

Claims 1, 11, 16, 24, 29, 31 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, for at least the same reasons, Claims 75, 107, 108, 111 and 112 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The other claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance therefore be issued in this case. Should matters remain which the Examiner believes could be resolved in a further

Appl. No. 09/916,543
Preliminary Amendment and Response to Office Action

Docket No. 85804-013500

telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

In this regard, Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by phone in California (Pacific Standard Time) at (714) 708-6500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below-listed address.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-2638. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number is referred when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2005

Carole A. Quinn
Reg. No. 39,000
Email: quinnc@gtlaw.com
Phone: (714) 708-6500

Customer Number 32361
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
Met Life Building
200 Park Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10166
Phone: (212) 801-9200
Fax: (212) 801-6400

oc-fs1\36224v01\85804.013500